

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

I. Status of the Claims

Claims 3-5 and 9- 11 are withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 1 and 2 have been amended and the amendments do not add new matter. Support for this amendment is found at least in Figure 13 as filed.

Claims 1, 2, 6-8, 10, and 12-14 are pending.

Claim 2 has been amended to correct the objection noted by the Examiner

II. Status of the Specification

Applicants have amended the Specification to correct typographical errors. No new matter has been added.

III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 6-8, and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,271,991 to Saliba et al. ("Saliba"). The Examiner contends that the AAPA discloses all of the elements except the teeth configuration and that Saliba discloses the teeth configuration. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1 and 2 have been amended to recite that when the brake-locking member and the reel teeth portion are mated, the vertical portion of each of the teeth of the reel portion contacts the vertical portion of each of the teeth of the brake portion on both sides of the vertical portion.

In contrast, the teeth of Saliba form gaps when mated and do not contact both vertical portions. Saliba, Figures 4 and 5, illustrate that when the teeth 60 of the break 70 engage the teeth 60 of the reel 18, only one side of the vertical portions of each tooth come into contact. Figure 5 illustrates that on the opposite side, a gap forms between the teeth 60 of the break 70 and the teeth 60 of the reel 18. Attached hereto as Exhibit A, is a copy of Saliba, Figures 4 and 5 illustrating the gap that is formed.

Additionally, the root 64 of the teeth 60 of reel 18 widen at their base to improve strength and abrasion resistance, as illustrated in Figure 5. Root 64 is required because neither the reel teeth 60 nor the break teeth 60 mate with both vertical portions of their respective mating tooth.

A further difference between the claimed invention and Saliba is that brake 70 is disposed to one side of reel 18 and thus Saliba teaches a non-coaxial arrangement between brake 70 and reel teeth 60. Figures 4, 5 and 6 clearly illustrate that the elements are not coaxial. Further, Saliba, on column 5, line 52 to column 6, line 4, teaches and suggests that if the brake is disposed within a cartridge it has the non-coaxial arrangement illustrated in Figure 6. Thus, Saliba does not teach or suggest a coaxial arrangement. The engagement of teeth in a coaxial arrangement allows the break teeth of the present invention to fully engage the reel teeth of the entire circumference of the reel.

Thus, Saliba does not teach or suggest all the elements of claims 1 and 2. Further, the AAPA, in Figure 11A, clearly illustrates a gap formed when the teeth are mated. Thus, the AAPA does not teach or suggest the missing elements from Saliba. Claims 6-8 and 12-14 depend from

claims 1 and 2 respectively and recite over the prior art of record based at least on their dependency to the independent claim. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Dated: July 19, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By


Louis J. DeJuidice

Registration No.: 47,522

DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 5257
New York, New York 10150-5257
(212) 527-7700
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant